



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/647,300	08/26/2003	Eunhyung Kim	Q76059	2617
23373 7590 04/06/2010 SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037				
EXAMINER LY, CHEYNE D				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2168				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/06/2010		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

sughrue@sughrue.com
PPROCESSING@SUGHRUE.COM
USPTO@SUGHRUE.COM

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/647,300

Applicant(s)

KIM ET AL.

Examiner

CHEYNE D. LY

Art Unit

2168

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on September 03, 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-14 and 16-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-14 and 16-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-06)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 2, 4-14, and 16-22 are examined on the merits.
2. Applicant's arguments filed September 03, 2009, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. On pages 8-9, Applicant argues Moriwake fails to disclose "both a search window and an edit window meeting the features recited in claim 1." Applicant's argument is not persuasive because Moriwake discloses a search window that displays image data of media files to be searched (page 14, [0206]-[0027], e.g. The library window 33 is an area for displaying the list of the material clips or the resultant clips registered in the clip database CDB. On the library window 33, as shown in FIG. 10 and FIG. 11, although only a title bar is displayed usually, the title bar is clicked to open a window, so that the library window 33 is entirely displayed as shown in FIG. 12. As shown in FIG. 12, on the library window 33, clips are displayed with a card graphic display 33A. At this time, the card graphic display 33A is composed of a still picture display part 33B, an attribute display part 33C, and a clip name display part 33D. The still picture of the in-point or the out-point of the clip is displayed on the still picture display part 33B. Thereby, an operator can understand easily that which of video data is the clip produced from by viewing the screen displayed on the still picture display part 33B).
3. Moriwake discloses a search window that displays image data of media files to be edited (pages 14-15, [0209]-[0013], e.g. Thus, in the library window 33, the clip which has been registered already in the clip database CDB is displayed as a list, so that the clip to be edited is easily selected among from the clips already registered. In addition, a scroll button 33E is displayed at the right side position of the library window 33. The scroll button 33E is

operated to scroll the library window 33 in the up and down direction, so that the all clips registered in the library window 33 can be displayed. Therefore, the clip which is not shown at present can be also selected. The time line window 51 is an area for placing the clips to be edited on the time axis to designate the content of edit. On the time line window 51 displayed at the edit module EM, the content relating to the edit processing is displayed. The time line window 51 is divided into areas. When roughly divided successively from the top, the areas are a time code display area (Time Code), an editing point display area (Edit Point), a preview extent display area (Preview), a video and effect specifying area (V), and an audio specifying area (A). The time code display area is an area for displaying the time code at the editing point. The time code is a time code on the time line of the resultant clip produced based on the edit content designated on the time line window 51. The editing point display area is an area for indicating points set as an editing point by triangle marks. For example, when the edit processing shown in FIG. 4 and FIG. 9 is specified, the editing points EP1 to EP5 are indicated by using triangle marks. However, in FIG. 12, since the area and the vicinity on which the transition effect is applied are only displayed on the time line window 51, the editing points EP2 to EP4 are only displayed. In addition, to display the editing point EP1 and the editing point EP5, as described later, the scroll button of the left and right direction is operated on the parameter setting window 52, so that the graphic image in the time line setting window 52 is scrolled in the left and right direction to display the editing point EP1 or the editing point EP5). The citation above reasonably describes the argued limitations as exemplified by the specification in Figures 6(a) and (b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

5. Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 12-14, 16, and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Moriwake et al. (US 2003/0117431 A1) (Moriwake hereafter).
6. In regard to claim 1, Moriwake discloses a media file management system, comprising:
7. a control signal input unit that receives at least one control signal transmitted from an input device to control operations of the media file management system (page 3, [0047] to [0054]);
8. an interface unit that accesses files stored in another information appliance by the control signal, and receives the media files (page 3, [0049], e.g. device controller instructs video disk recorder to reproduce a material...stored in the internal disc recording medium).
- a media file management unit that creates a search window that displays image data of media files to be searched (page 8, [0131] e.g. clip tree window) and an edit window that displays image data of a media content file to be edited, when the media file is required to be edited (page 9, [0140], e.g. clip being displayed at present to be edited, and Figures 10-12), and searching and managing the media files through the search window or the edit window in accordance with the at least one control signal (claim 43); and

9. a display driving unit that displays the search window and the edit window together in a single display screen, wherein the media file management unit is implemented in a single program application (Figures 10-12).
10. In regard to claim 2, Moriwake discloses a memory unit that stores the media file edited by the media file management unit (page 9, [0136], e.g. clip database, and page 3, [0060], e.g. a RAM 21B in which the up-loaded application software and database are stored); and a display driving unit generates displayable results of the editing of the media file by the media file management unit (Figures 10-12).
11. In regard to claim 3, Moriwake discloses an interface unit that accesses media files stored in another information appliance (page 3, [0049], e.g. device controller instructs video disk recorder to reproduce a material...stored in the internal disc recording medium).
12. In regard to claim 5, Moriwake discloses the media files are album files containing at least one of image, music or movie files (page 5, [0081], e.g. one sequence of the video moving image data is defined as clip video data, and Figure 12, e.g. Library 33).
13. In regard to claim 6, Moriwake discloses wherein the media file management unit comprises:
14. an application driving unit that drives an application configured to manipulate a type of media file selected, and manages the media file through the application (page 13, [0189], e.g. the clip displayed on the library window 33 is clicked first or the clip displayed on the clip tree window 31 is clicked, so as to select the clip to be edited);
an edit window creation unit that creates the search window (Figures 10-12, e.g. tree 31) or the edit window (Figures 10-12, e.g. Editor); and

a media file search unit that searches for media files stored in at least one of the memory unit and another information appliance (claim 43).

15. In regard to claim 8, Moriwake discloses the media file management unit causes results of the execution of a file edit command for a media file selected in the search window to be displayed in the edit window (page 13, [0189], e.g. the clip displayed on the library window 33 is clicked first or the clip displayed on the clip tree window 31 is clicked, so as to select the clip to be edited).
16. In regard to claims 12-15, 16, and 17, Moriwake describes the claimed system (Figure 1) for the implementing the claimed as cited above.
17. In regard to claims 20-22, Moriwake describes the claimed computer readable medium (Figure 1) for the implementing the claimed as cited above.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 USC § 103

18. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

19. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to

point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

20. Claims 9-11, 18, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moriwake et al. (US 2003/0117431 A1) (Moriwake hereafter) taken with Meyers et al. (2001) (Myers hereafter).
21. In regard to claim 9, Moriwake describes the claimed invention except for the limitation of the media file management unit causes results of the execution of a file edit command for a media file selected in the edit window to be displayed in the search window. Myers discloses the media file management unit causes results of the execution of a file edit command for a media file selected in the edit window to be displayed in the search window (page 112, column 2, lines 1-3, e.g. "the user selects a portion of the video on one view in Silver, the equivalent portion is highlighted in all other views" as exemplified in Figure 1). Moriwake describes an invention to provide an editing system which can realize the simplified and high-speed edit by managing a plurality of materials with the original hierarchical structure. Further, based on the management information, this invention is to realize the simplified and high-speed edit by managing a plurality of materials to be the most suitable for the edit processing (page 1, [0007]). While, Myers describes a video editor with the goal of making editing of digital video as easy as text editing (page 106, Abstract). Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated by Moriwake to improve the editor of Myers to provide an editing system which

can realize the simplified and high-speed edit by managing a plurality of materials with the original hierarchical structure and to realize the simplified and high-speed edit by managing a plurality of materials to be the most suitable for the edit processing.

22. In regard to claim 10, Moriwake in view of Myers discloses the file edit command includes delete command (page 111, column 1, lines 3-4, e.g. delete).
23. In regard to claim 11, Moriwake in view of Myers discloses the media file management unit is configured to copy the media file selected in the search window into the edit window in response to the Copy command being selected, and is configured to move the media file selected in the search window into the edit window in response to the Move command being selected (page 111, column 1, lines 3-4, e.g. copy and paste wherein paste has been interpreted as “move”).
24. In regard to claims 18 and 19, Moriwake in view of Myers describes the claimed system for the implementing the claimed as cited above.
25. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moriwake et al. (US 2003/0117431 A1) (Moriwake hereafter) and Myers et al. (2001) (Myers hereafter) as applied to claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8-16, and 18-22 above, and further in view of Chernock et al. (US 6,229,524B1) (Chernock hereafter).
26. In regard to claim 4, Myers describes the claimed invention except for the limitation of “universal remote control function.” Chernock describes the transmission of video data with the use of universal remote control function (column 4, lines 64-65, e.g. Universal Remote Control). Chernock describes an improvement to well known in the art video editors (column 1, lines 31-33) by providing a simple interface that allows a viewer to navigate a

cursor among current hot spots and make a selection of function associated with one of them (column 2, line 66, to column 3, line 2). Moriwake describes an invention to provide an editing system which can realize the simplified and high-speed edit by managing a plurality of materials with the original hierarchical structure. Further, based on the management information, this invention is to realize the simplified and high-speed edit by managing a plurality of materials to be the most suitable for the edit processing (page 1, [0007]). While, Myers describes a video editor interface comprising a cursor for user selection (page 111, section 6.5 Preview View, e.g. user moves the cursor through the time line). Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated by Chernock to improve the editor of Moriwake and Myers to provide a simple interface that allows a viewer to navigate a cursor. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the method of Moriwake and Myers with the universal remote control device of Chernock to provide a simple interface that allows a viewer to navigate a cursor via a Universal Remote Control.

27. Claims 7 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moriwake et al. (US 2003/0117431 A1) (Moriwake hereafter) and Myers et al. (2001) (Myers hereafter) as applied to claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8-16, and 18-22 above.
28. In regard to claims 7 and 17, Moriwake describes the claimed invention except for the limitation of the paths of the media files are displayed in the edit window or the search window. Myers suggest a plan to add support for many other views such as adding WWW links (paths) in all other views might also be useful. Moriwake describes an invention to provide an editing system which can realize the simplified and high-speed edit by managing

a plurality of materials with the original hierarchical structure. Further, based on the management information, this invention is to realize the simplified and high-speed edit by managing a plurality of materials to be the most suitable for the edit processing (page 1, [0007]). While, Myers describes a video editor with the goal of making editing of digital video as easy as text editing (page 106, Abstract). Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated by Myers to add WWW links (paths) in all other views. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the method of Moriwake and Myers with the paths of the media files are displayed in the edit window or the search window.

CONCLUSION

29. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).
30. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.
31. Patent applicants with problems or questions regarding electronic images that can be viewed in the Patent Application Information Retrieval system (PAIR) can now contact the

USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center (Patent EBC) for assistance. Representatives are available to answer your questions daily from 6 am to midnight (EST). The toll free number is (866) 217-9197. When calling please have your application serial or patent number, the type of document you are having an image problem with, the number of pages and the specific nature of the problem. The Patent Electronic Business Center will notify applicants of the resolution of the problem within 5-7 business days. Applicants can also check PAIR to confirm that the problem has been corrected. The USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center is a complete service center supporting all patent business on the Internet. The USPTO's PAIR system provides Internet-based access to patent application status and history information. It also enables applicants to view the scanned images of their own application file folder(s) as well as general patent information available to the public.

32. For all other customer support, please call the USPTO Call Center (UCC) at 800-786-9199. The USPTO's official fax number is 571-272-8300.
33. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to C. Dune Ly, whose telephone number is (571) 272-0716. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8 A.M. to 4 P.M.
34. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tim Vo, can be reached on (571)272-3642.

/Cheyne D Ly/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2168